

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx  
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
 Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW</b>		Docket Number (Optional)  20028-7004
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 2px;">           Application Number            10/812,295-Conf.            #1807         </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 2px;">           First Named Inventor            Sutherland C. Ellwood, Jr.         </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">           Art Unit            2871         </div>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px; margin-bottom: 2px;">           Filed            March 29, 2004         </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">           Examiner            T. L. Rude         </div>	
<p>Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.</p> <p>This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.</p> <p>The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).          Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.</p> <p>I am the</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; align-items: flex-start;"> <div style="width: 60%;"> <input type="checkbox"/> applicant /inventor.   <input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest.            See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record.            Registration number <u>33,466</u>   <input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.            Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____         </div> <div style="width: 35%; text-align: center;"> <u>/Michael E. Woods/</u>            Signature   <u>Michael E. Woods</u>            Typed or printed name   <u>(408) 490-4692</u>            Telephone number   <u>August 23, 2007</u>            Date         </div> </div> <p>NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.</p>		
<input type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>1</u> forms are submitted.		

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: 23 August 2007 Electronic Signature for Michael E. Woods: /Michael E. Woods/

## REASONS FOR REVIEW: Pre-Appeal Brief Request

1. The rejection is improper in that it mischaracterizes the primary reference (DILLON – US Patent 5,031,983) as teaching a modulator for all claim rejections. DILLON unambiguously teaches isolator ONLY – this device cannot have variable attenuation.
2. The rejection is improper for combining DILLON and BISCHEL (US Patent 6,078,704). DILLON is a magneto-optic Faraday based isolator for COMMUNICATIONS systems that depends upon a polarization angle within a waveguide to set an output while BISCHEL is a DISPLAY technology that teaches an electro-optic based display system that uses variable indices of refraction to transversely extract a picture element component.
3. The rejection is not clear how the two disparate systems of DILLON and BISCHEL may be combined (assuming it is proper to combine them) and how specifically the combined references matches the express claim limitations.
4. The rejection of original claims 19–36 improperly uses a new grounds of rejection without providing applicant with an opportunity for a new response.